HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

PATENT APPLICATION

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 100201040-1

IN THE
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Inventor(s): Kirk Steven Tecu et al

Confirmation No.: 3339

Application No.: 10/077500

Examiner: Lin Ye

Filing Date: Feb 14, 2002

Group Art Unit: 2615

Title: Camera That Uses Flash Illumination To Assist In Composition

Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents
Commissioner For Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TRANSMITTAL OF APPEAL BRIEF

Transmitted herewith is the Appeal Brief in this application with respect to the Notice of Appeal filed on 7-20-2006.

The fee for filing this Appeal Brief is (37 CFR 1.17(c)) $500.00.

(complete (a) or (b) as applicable)

The proceedings herein are for a patent application and the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a) apply.

☐ (a) Applicant petitions for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136 (fees: 37 CFR 1.17(a)-(d)) for the total number of months checked below:

☐ 1st Month $120	☐ 2nd Month $450	☐ 3rd Month $1020	☐ 4th Month $1590

☐ The extension fee has already been filed in this application.

☒ (b) Applicant believes that no extension of time is required. However, this conditional petition is being made to provide for the possibility that applicant has inadvertently overlooked the need for a petition and fee for extension of time.

Please charge to Deposit Account 08-2025 the sum of $ 500. At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account 08-2025 pursuant to 37 CFR 1.25. Additionally please charge any fees to Deposit Account 08-2025 under 37 CFR 1.16 through 1.21 inclusive, and any other sections in Title 37 of the Code of Federal Regulations that may regulate fees. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

☐ I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
Date of Deposit:

OR

☒ I hereby certify that this paper is being transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office facsimile number (571)273-8300.
Date of facsimile: 7-20-2006
Typed Name: Cathi Christensen
Signature: Cathi Christensen

Respectfully submitted,
Kirk Steven Tecu et al
By David W. Boyd
David W. Boyd
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Reg No.: 50,335
Date: 7-20-2006
Telephone: 970 898 4475

Rev 10/05 (ApiBrief)

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
IP Administration, mail stop 35
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

PATENT APPLICATION

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 100201040-1

IN THE
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Inventor(s): Tecu et al.

Serial No.: 10/077,500
Filing Date: 2/14/2002

Examiner: Lin Ye
Group Art Unit: 2615

Title: A camera that uses flash illumination to assist in composition

BRIEF ON APPEAL

THE ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS
Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

Pursuant to the provisions of 37 C.F.R. § 41.30 *et seq.*, applicants hereby appeal to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences from the examiner's rejection dated 5/30/2006. The claims at issue have been finally rejected. This brief on appeal is accompanied by the requisite fee (37 C.F.R § 41.37(a)(2) and § 41.20(b)(2)).

I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The entire interest in the present application has been assigned to Hewlett-Packard Development Company, L.P., as recorded at Reel 013776, Frame 0928.

II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

There are no related appeals or interferences.

III. STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-24 are pending in the application, stand rejected, and are the subject of this appeal.

IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

No amendments have been filed after the final rejection mailed 5/30/2006.

V. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

Claim 1 is directed to a camera that is described in the specification at least at page 2 lines 18-19, page 3 lines 6-24, page 4 lines 14-20, and in Figure 1. The camera comprises a strobe (106) for supplying light to a scene, and the strobe flashes repeatedly during composition of a photograph.

Claim 11 is directed to a method that is described in the specification at least at page 4 lines 14-20 and in Figures 2 and 3. In the method of claim 11, a strobe is flashed repeatedly throughout composition of a photograph.

Claim 19 is directed to a camera that is described at least at page 2 lines 18-19, page 3 lines 6-24, page 4 lines 14-20, and in Figure 1. The camera comprises strobe means (106) for supplying light to a scene, electronics means (108) for driving the strobe, and logic means (110) for controlling the electronics means (108) so that the strobe flashes repeatedly during composition of a photograph performed by a user of the camera.

Claim 23 is directed to a camera that is described in the specification at least at page 2 lines 18-19, page 3 lines 6-24, page 4 line 14 through page 5 line 17, and in Figure 1. The camera comprises a strobe (106) for supplying light to a scene and a shutter release (112) having a partially depressed position and a fully depressed position. The camera flashes the strobe repeatedly throughout an interval beginning after a time when the shutter release

reaches the partially depressed position and ending at a time when the shutter release reaches the fully depressed position.

Claim 24 is directed to a method that is described in the specification at least at page 4 line 14 through page 5 line 17 and in Figures 2 and 3. In the method of claim 24, it is detected when a shutter release of a camera reaches a partially depressed position, repeated flashing of a strobe is initiated, and the repeated flashing is continued until it is detected that the shutter release has reached a fully depressed position.

VI. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

Whether claims 1-3, 5-7, 11-13 and 15-19 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Tanaka (U.S. Pat. App. Pub. 2001/0043277) in view of Matsui (U.S. Pat. App. Pub. 2002/0048457).

Whether claims 4 and 14 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Tanaka in view of Matsui and Iwai (U.S. Pat. No. 5,198,855).

Whether claims 8-10 and 20-22 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Tanaka in view of Matsui and Umeda (U.S. Pat. No. 5,920,342).

Whether claims 23 and 24 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Tanaka in view of Matsui.

VII. ARGUMENT

A. APPLICABLE LAW

"To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of the ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations." MPEP 2143.

"If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim dependent therefrom is nonobvious." MPEP 2143.03, citing *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Facts may be officially noticed when they are "capable of such instant and unquestionable demonstration as to defy dispute." *In re Ahlert and Kruger*, 165 USPQ 418,

420 (CCPA 1970).

"To reach a proper determination under 35 U.S.C. 103, the examiner must step backward in time and into the shoes worn by the hypothetical "person of ordinary skill in the art" when the invention was unknown and just before it was made. In view of all factual information, the examiner must then make a determination whether the claimed invention "as a whole" would have been obvious at that time to that person. **Knowledge of applicant's disclosure must be put aside in reaching this determination**.... [I]mpermissible hindsight must be avoided and the legal conclusion must be reached on the basis of the facts gleaned **from the prior art**." (MPEP 2142, emphasis added).

B. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-3, 5-7, 11-13 AND 15-19 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 5-7, 11-13 and 15-19 as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Tanaka (U.S. Pat. App. Pub. 2001/0043277) in view of Matsui (U.S. Pat. App. Pub. 2002/0048457). Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection is improper because the examiner has not made out a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

i. Claim 1

The examiner's *prima facie* case of obviousness with regard to claim 1 is deficient at least because the combined references do not teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 1.

Claim 1 recites in part a camera comprising a strobe for supplying light to a scene, the strobe flashing repeatedly throughout composition of a photograph. The examiner relies on Tanaka to teach a strobe flashing throughout composition of a photograph, citing paragraph [0173] of Tanaka, but admits that Tanaka does not describe a strobe flashing repeatedly throughout composition of a photograph. (Paper 20060525 page 5) The examiner relies on Matsui to show the strobe flashing repeatedly, and asserts that Applicant's invention is obvious in view of the combination of Tanaka and Matsui. (Paper 20060525 pages 5-6)

Applicant disagrees, and respectfully submits that neither Tanaka nor Matsui nor their combination describes a strobe flashing throughout composition of a photograph, repeatedly or otherwise.

As Applicant has explained at page 5 of the specification, composition of a

photograph "may begin when the photographer begins using the viewfinder or display to view the scene and evaluate camera positions for compositional quality." Composition "typically ends when the photographer indicates, for example by fully depressing the shutter release, that he or she wishes the camera to initiate its final photograph taking sequence...."

Paragraph [173] of Tanaka describes a single "pre-light emission" performed by the flash and used to take a "pre-light emission image". Clearly, a single "pre-light emission" cannot occur throughout composition of a photograph. And in fact, Figure 12 of Tanaka shows the "pre-light emission" ending significantly before the shutter button reaches the fully-depressed "S2" position, when composition typically ends. Clearly, Tanaka does not teach or suggest a strobe flashing throughout composition of a photograph.

The examiner makes much of the fact that Figure 12 of Tanaka seems to show "at least two pre-light emission images captured by CCD during the pre-light emission period", and asserts that "more than two frames of pre-light emission images are displayed on the EVF 20 or LCD 10 for composition of a photograph". (Paper 20060525 pages 2-3) Applicant first respectfully notes that claim 1 is not concerned with how many "pre-light emission images" may be captured or displayed. Claim 1 recites a strobe flashing repeatedly throughout composition of a photograph. The number of pre-light emission images captured or displayed is irrelevant.

Furthermore, Applicant disagrees with the examiner's interpretation of Tanaka's Figure 12 and its description in Tanaka's paragraph [0173]. Paragraph [0173] describes "[a] still image (also called a pre-light emission image)" that is "displayed on the EVF 20 for at least a predetermined period T1". Later, when the shutter button reaches S2, "the flash 5 flashes normally" and "a still image (also called a flash image) ... is obtained by the CCD." Then "the flash image is displayed on the LCD 10 for a predetermined period T2...." Applicant believes that Tanaka captures only a single pre-light emission image, which is displayed on the EVF during the period labeled "(PREVIEW DISPLAY)", and a single "flash image", which is displayed on the LCD during the period labeled "(AFTER VIEW)". Any other images captured or displayed during this sequence are apparently not taken using the flash. Applicant believes any appearance to the contrary is the result of Tanaka's Figure 12 not being drawn to scale. A strobe flashing "normally" typically has a flash duration of about 1 millisecond (see the Matsui reference paragraph [0008]), and so could not provide illumination for enough time to capture two CCD images 1/30th second apart as the examiner

believes Tanaka to do. Furthermore, there would be no reason to capture two images 1/30th second apart and then display only one of them.

Clearly, Tanaka still does not teach or suggest a strobe flashing throughout composition of a photograph, repeatedly or otherwise.

Matsui does describe flashing a strobe repeatedly for determining camera exposure settings, but contains no suggestion that the flashing continues throughout composition of a photograph. The examiner belatedly asserts that Matsui "teaches in Figure 2, the flashes (pre-flashes) continue throughout composition of a photograph until determining a condition of a right amount of light for performing an actual-flash when the photographing by the camera is performed (See, Pate 1, [0015] and page 4, [0064])." (Paper 20060525 page 3) Applicant emphatically disagrees. Matsui is concerned with "pre-flash" used to characterize a scene so that a proper amount of light may later be provided by an "actual-flash". (Matsui paragraph [0015]) Paragraphs [0057] and [0058] of Matsui (describing Figure 2) make clear that Matsui's pre-flash occurs *after* composition is complete. Paragraph [0057] describes events that occur when the photographer "half-depresses a shutter release switch". Paragraph [0058] describes events that occur when "the shutter release switch is [fully] depressed", including that "the arithmetic and control circuit 41 instructs ... that the pre-flash should be performed." This is exactly the scenario described in the background section of Applicant's specification, which indicates that this kind of pre-flash occurs after composition is complete and too late to aid the photographer in composition. (Applicant's specification page 2) Matsui's paragraph [0064] describes multiple flashes used as pre-flash, but these multiple flashes also occur after composition is complete.

Since neither Tanaka nor Matsui teaches or suggests a strobe flashing throughout composition of a photograph, repeatedly or otherwise, then neither does their combination, and the examiner's *prima facie* case fails.

The examiner objects that Applicant is arguing against the references individually where the rejection is based on a combination of the references. (Paper 20060525 page 2) Applicant has not argued that neither of the references teaches or suggests all of the limitations of claim 1 (although that is true). Applicant has instead argued that at least one

particular limitation of claim 1 is not taught or suggested by either reference, and therefore the combination of the two references also does not teach or suggest that claim limitation. The examiner's objection is misplaced.

In view of the above, claim 1 is believed allowable over the combination of Tanaka and Matsui.

ii. Claims 2, 3, and 5-7

Claims 2, 3, and 5-7 depend from claim 1 and add further limitations, and are therefore also believed allowable over the cited references.

iii. Claims 11-13 and 15-18

Claim 11 is an independent method claim analogous to claim 1. Claim 11 recites a method of controlling a camera comprising flashing a strobe repeatedly throughout composition of a photograph. As is explained above with respect to claim 1, neither Tanaka nor Matsui nor their combination teaches or suggests flashing a strobe throughout composition of a photograph, repeatedly or otherwise. Claim 11 is therefore believed allowable over the combination of Tanaka and Matsui.

Claims 12, 13, and 15-18 depend from claim 11 and add further limitations, and are therefore also believed allowable over the cited references.

iv. Claim 19

Claim 19 is an independent apparatus claim that recites in part a camera comprising strobe means for supplying light to a scene, electronics means for driving the strobe, and logic means for controlling the strobe and electronics means, wherein the logic means flashes the strobe repeatedly throughout composition of a photograph performed by a user of the camera.

As is explained above with respect to claim 1, neither Tanaka nor Matsui nor their combination teaches or suggests flashing a strobe throughout composition of a photograph, repeatedly or otherwise. Claim 19 is therefore believed allowable over the combination of Tanaka and Matsui.

B. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 4 AND 14 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The examiner has rejected claims 4 and 14 as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Tanaka (U.S. Pat. App. Pub. 2001/0043277) in view of Matsui (U.S. Pat. App. Pub. 2002/0048457) and Iwai (U.S. Pat. No 5,198,855). Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection is improper because the examiner has not made out a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Claim 4 depends from claim 1 and adds further limitations. Claim 14 depends from claim 11 and adds further limitations. As is explained above, the combination of Tanaka and Matsui does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 1 or claim 11, and therefore does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 4 or claim 14. Iwai also does not teach or suggest a camera comprising a strobe the flashes repeatedly throughout composition of a photograph, and thus the combined references still do not teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 4 or of claim 14. Claims 4 and 14 are believed allowable over the cited references.

C. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 8-10 AND 20-22 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The examiner has rejected claims 8-10 and 20-22 as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Tanaka (U.S. Pat. App. Pub. 2001/0043277) in view of Matsui (U.S. Pat. App. Pub. 2002/0048457) and Umeda (U.S. Pat. No 5,920,342). Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection is improper because the examiner has not made out a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Claims 8-10 depend from claim 1 and add further limitations. Claims 20-22 depend from claim 11 and add further limitations. As is explained above, the combination of Tanaka and Matsui does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 1 or claim 11, and therefore does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of claims 8-10 or claims 20-22. Umeda also does not teach or suggest a camera comprising a strobe that flashes repeatedly throughout composition of a photograph, and thus the combined references still do not teach or suggest all of the limitations of claims 8-10 or of claims 20-22. Claims 8-10 and 20-22 are believed allowable over the cited references.

D. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 23 AND 24 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The examiner has rejected claims 23 and 24 as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §

103(a) over Tanaka (U.S. Pat. App. Pub. 2001/0043277) in view of Matsui (U.S. Pat. App. Pub. 2002/0048457). Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection is improper because the examiner has not made out a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Claim 23 recites in part the camera flashing the strobe repeatedly throughout an interval beginning after a time when the shutter release reaches the partially depressed position and ending at a time when the shutter release reaches the fully depressed position. The examiner relies on Tanaka to show a strobe flashing beginning after a time when the shutter release reaches the partially depressed position, and on Matsui to show a strobe flashing repeatedly, but admits that the references do not teach or suggest repeated flashing throughout an interval ... ending at a time when the shutter release reaches the fully depressed position. (Paper 20060525 pages 18-19)

The examiner then attempts to use Applicant's own specification to supply this missing element. (Paper 20060525 page 19) This is entirely improper.

The particular passage at issue describes the frequency at which the repeated flashes occur, and states

> [a]t step 212, the camera repeatedly checks to see if the proper time interval has elapsed since the last flash. A proper interval could be for example 250 milliseconds, but a **camera designer of skill in the art** may select a different interval based on the photographer's viewing comfort, the strobe energy capacity, the expected time that the camera will be in the preview mode, the energy expended in each preview strobe, the camera's strobe recharge capability, and other factors. ... Alternatively, time interval could be nonexistent and the camera could proceed directly to step 214.
>
> In step 214, the camera determines if the photographer has indicated, for example by fully depressing the shutter release button, that a final photograph is to be taken. If so, the preview mode ends and the camera proceeds with its final photograph taking sequence in step 216.

(Applicant's specification page 7 lines 5-20, emphasis added)

The examiner relies on this passage to teach a "nonexistent" interval between flashes and asserts that therefore it would have been obvious to modify the system of Tanaka to make Tanaka's "pre-light emission" continue until the S2 position is reached. (Paper 20060525 page 19) While that is not the point of the cited passage, it is true as shown in Figure 2 that if the cited interval is "nonexistent" and the shutter release has reached its fully depressed position the camera proceeds directly to its final photograph taking sequence, resulting in the

repeated flashes continuing until the shutter release reaches the fully depressed position. That is, after all, a claimed aspect of Applicant's invention.

But the examiner takes this passage as an admission that it was known in the art before Applicant's disclosure to make a flash interval "nonexistent", and relies on it in attempting to complete a *prima facie* case of obviousness. (Paper 20060525 page 19)

Applicant has made no such admission. Apparently the examiner has assumed that a "camera designer of skill in the art" must necessarily refer to a designer in the past. In context, the reference is clearly to a designer who has the benefit of Applicant's disclosure. The passage simply states that a camera designer will make a design choice in implementing an embodiment of the invention, lists several factors that may affect the designer's decision, and suggests two possible choices for the interval between flashes.

Note particularly that the cited passage is not in the background section of Applicant's specification, but is in the detailed description of *an embodiment of the invention.* In effect, the examiner has cited Applicant's invention as prior art against itself.

It bears repeating here that

> [t]o reach a proper determination under 35 U.S.C. 103, the examiner must step backward in time and into the shoes worn by the hypothetical "person of ordinary skill in the art" when the invention was unknown and just before it was made. In view of all factual information, the examiner must then make a determination whether the claimed invention "as a whole" would have been obvious at that time to that person. **Knowledge of applicant's disclosure must be put aside in reaching this determination....** [I]mpermissible hindsight must be avoided and the legal conclusion must be reached on the basis of the facts gleaned **from the prior art.**"

(MPEP 2142, emphasis added).

The examiner also asserts that the Matsui reference "teaches no time interval between the pre-flash and actual-flash", but does not provide a citation for this assertion. (Paper 20060525 page 4) Applicant notes that in the flowchart in Matsui's Figure 2, steps S3, S4, S5, and S14 all occur between step S13 (NOTIFICATION OF THE END OF PRE-FLASH) and step S15 (START OF DISCRETE FLASH).

Finally, Applicant hereby challenges the propriety of the examiner's taking Official Notice that "both the concept and the advantages of adjusting the flashing interval according to the photographer's desire are well known and expected in the art." (Paper 20060525 page

4 and page 19). This assertion is the subject of much of this brief, and is therefore clearly not a fact "capable of such instant and unquestionable demonstration as to defy dispute." *In re Ahlert and Kruger*, 165 USPQ 418, 420 (CCPA 1970). If the rejection is to be maintained in a further office action, the examiner is obligated to provide adequate evidence of factual assertions hereby challenged as not properly officially noticed. MPEP 2144.03(C)

Clearly, as the examiner admits, the cited *prior art* references, even in combination, do not teach or suggest all of the elements of Applicant's claim 23, and claim 23 is believed allowable.

Claim 24 is a method claim analogous to apparatus claim 23, and recites in part continuing the repeated flashing until detecting that the shutter release has reached a fully depressed position. Claim 24 is believed allowable for the reasons given above with respect to claim 23.

VIII. CONCLUSION

In view of the above, applicant respectfully requests that all of the examiner's claim rejections be reversed.

Respectfully submitted,

By David W. Boyd

David W. Boyd
Reg. Number 50,335

July 20, 2006
Fort Collins, CO 80525
(970) 898-4475

CLAIMS APPENDIX

1. A camera comprising a strobe for supplying light to a scene, the strobe flashing repeatedly throughout composition of a photograph.

2. The camera of claim 1 further comprising a preview mode wherein the strobe flashes repeatedly.

3. The camera of claim 2 further comprising a user control by which the user selects the preview mode.

4. The camera of claim 1, further comprising a user control and wherein:
   a) in response to a first setting of the user control, the strobe flashes repeatedly throughout composition of a photograph; and
   b) in response to a second setting of the user control, the strobe does not flash during the composition of a photograph.

5. The camera of claim 1 further comprising:
   a) a light sensor, and
   b) comparison means for comparing a light level measured with the light sensor to a threshold value, and wherein
   the camera enables strobe flashes throughout composition of a photograph when the light level is below the threshold value, and disables the strobe flashes during composition of a photograph when the light level is above the threshold value.

6. The camera of claim 1 further comprising strobe electronics for driving the strobe, the strobe electronics having an energy storage capacity, each strobe flash during composition of a photograph dissipating less than all of the energy stored in the strobe electronics.

7. The camera of claim 6 wherein the amount of strobe energy dissipated for one strobe flash is different from the amount of strobe energy dissipated for another strobe flash.

8. The camera of claim 1 further comprising:
   a) an electronic array light sensor; and
   b) a logic unit that controls the electronic array light sensor and receives image data from the electronic array light sensor; and
   c) a display that displays an image under control of the logic unit;
   wherein the camera takes and displays preview photographs repeatedly on the display during composition of a final photograph by the user, and wherein the camera flashes the strobe once for each preview image.

9. The camera of claim 8 wherein the camera flashes the strobe more often than once for each preview image.

10. The camera of claim 9 wherein at least one of the preview images uses a different number strobe flashes than another preview image.

11. A method of controlling a camera comprising flashing a strobe repeatedly throughout composition of a photograph.

12. The method of claim 11 further comprising the steps of:
   a) detecting a user control; and
   b) entering a preview mode in response to the detecting step.

13. The method of claim 12 further comprising the steps of:
   a) exiting the preview mode; and
   b) suspending the repeated flashes of the strobe.

14. The method of claim 12 further comprising:

a) in response to a first setting of the user control, entering the preview mode and flashing the strobe repeatedly throughout composition of a photograph; and

b) in response to a second setting of the user control, entering the preview mode without flashing the strobe.

15. The method of claim 11 further comprising using a preview photograph taken during composition of a final photograph in determining the proper strobe energy to use in taking the final photograph.

16. The method of claim 11 further comprising dissipating less than all of an energy storage capacity of strobe electronics with each flash of the strobe during composition of a photograph.

17. The method of claim 16 wherein the amount of strobe energy dissipated for one strobe flash is different from the amount of strobe energy dissipated for another strobe flash.

18. The method of claim 11 further comprising the steps of.

a) measuring the scene lighting level using a light sensor; and

b) comparing the scene lighting level with a threshold value; and

c) enabling the strobe flashes during composition of a photograph when the scene lighting level is below the threshold value and disabling the strobe flashes during composition when the scene lighting level is above the threshold value.

19. A camera comprising:

a) strobe means for supplying light to a scene; and

b) electronics means for driving the strobe; and

c) logic means for controlling the strobe and electronics means, wherein the logic means flashes the strobe repeatedly throughout composition of a photograph performed by a user of the camera.

20. The method of claim 11, further comprising:

taking preview photographs repeatedly during composition of a final photograph;

displaying the preview photographs on a display comprised in the camera; and

flashing the strobe at least once for each preview photograph.

21. The method of claim 20, further comprising flashing the strobe more often than once for each preview photograph.

22. The method of claim 21, further comprising flashing the strobe a different number of times for one preview photograph than for another preview photograph.

23. A camera, comprising:

a strobe for supplying light to a scene; and

a shutter release having a partially depressed position and a fully depressed position;

the camera flashing the strobe repeatedly throughout an interval beginning after a time when the shutter release reaches the partially depressed position and ending at a time when the shutter release reaches the fully depressed position.

24. A method, comprising:

detecting that a shutter release of a camera has reached a partially depressed position;

initiating repeated flashing of a strobe of the camera after the reaching of the partially depressed position; and

continuing the repeated flashing until detecting that the shutter release has reached a fully depressed position.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
JUL 20 2006

EVIDENCE APPENDIX

None.

RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

None.